

by law, and if the pharmacist supplies such preparations of other standards, he becomes liable to the law for his misconduct. Thus is the patient protected from the greed of the manufacturer. If you prescribe some unofficial preparation, something not in the Pharmacopeia, you have absolutely no assurance of what your patient will ingest. It is said that a large proportion of physicians have never seen the Pharmacopeia, never have used it, never were taught anything about it. At a banquet not long ago a recent graduate of a prominent medical school stated that materia medica and therapeutics had not been taught in his school for several years! No wonder the pharmacist's shelves are loaded with nostrums and reduplicated preparations each with a still more fanciful name, and his prescription files with so-called "prescriptions" for preparations of unknown value or composition! Is it not time, gentlemen of the medical profession, that we should study a little of the Pharmacopeia and teach ourselves a little of what we should know? Or shall we continue forever to "learn" our therapeutics from the smooth-tongued detail man of the nostrum manufacturer? Remember that important changes in the strength of some of the common and generally used drugs have been made; see the table on page 274.

Sufficient time has now elapsed for us to take a relatively broad view of the results obtained in the treatment of malignant growths to

**THE X-RAY IN CANCER.** X-ray exposures. Dr. Wm. B. Coley, of New York, presents a very full statement of his experiences in the treatment of 167 conditions of malignancy by this means, in the *Annals of Surgery* for August. Coley refers to his statements made at the time when this procedure was first suggested, and says, "I then believed, and have since maintained, that the treatment should be strictly limited to inoperable and recurrent cancer, or applied as a post-operative measure that might possibly render recurrences less likely to take place." The whole paper is interesting, and his conclusions seem to be sound and conservative. "The use of the X-ray as a preoperative measure in other than cutaneous cancer is contraindicated, 1, because the agent has not yet been proven to be curative; 2, because of serious risks of an extension of the disease to inaccessible glands or to other regions by metastases during the period required for a trial of the X-ray."

Your attention is particularly called to a special report from the Tuberculosis Committee of the State Society on page 294, relating to the subject of notification. At the last meeting of the society, at Riverside, this question was brought up and passed to the Council. The Council instructed the secretary to request the opinions of the various component societies, and to report them to the Council when secured.

In view of these facts it would seem well for all county societies to consider carefully the special report herewith published, and to adopt resolutions along the lines indicated, if such action shall seem wise after due deliberation. It must be remembered that the Tuberculosis Committee has given this matter very careful thought; it has been in existence now for nearly three years, and has studied these matters with great attention to present conditions and probable results, and consequently the suggestions of the committee should not be lightly cast aside or neglected. The statements which they make are moderate and sensible, and doubtless if it shall be the wish of the component societies that their recommendations be concurred in, considerable good will result. It is strongly urged, for the sake of uniformity, that if the attitude of the committee is supported by component societies, that all resolutions passed be more or less in conformity with the suggestions of the report.

Practically all the so-called "patent medicines"—by which is really meant the nostrums advertised and sold directly to the laity—were originally "proprietary" introduced through the kindly offices of the medical

**THE COURSE OF PROPRIETARIES.** profession and later given directly to the public. Most of those at present in vogue with the medical profession will undoubtedly take the same course in due time. Ask any pharmacist what will eventually happen if you give a patient a prescription for one of these "proprietary" (really nostrums), say pepto-mangan, bovine, sanmetto, tongaline, seng, etc. He will tell you that in due course the patient, or his wife, or his mother, or his children, or his sisters, or his cousins, or his aunts, or his wife's friends will come into the store and buy some more of the same stuff—but without a prescription. In other words, you have lost a patient, and you have helped to induce some one or more persons to become self-dosers. Sooner or later mostly all of this class of nostrums will be sold—and probably advertised—directly to the laity. Already this is the case with a number, notably antikamnia, and we frequently see a drug store window decorated with bottles of pepto-mangan, Fellow's syrup, etc., at special cut rates. Some months ago the "bovine" concern wrote to the JOURNAL in high indignation because we had stated that they appealed to the laity direct. We have recently received some copies of a paper printed, apparently, at Athol, Mass., and entitled "The Healthy Home." In this journal, which, from its general appearance, seems to be intended to aid the layman in prescribing for himself, we read the following interesting advertisement: "Bovine makes rosy-cheeked children. It brings bloom to pale faces, flesh to thin bodies. \* \* \* Your physician will heartily endorse it. Every druggist sells it. The Bovine Company, New York." The words in italic clearly indicate that this advertisement is not intended for the phy-